

1 GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP  
2 CLEMENT L. GLYNN, Bar No. 57117  
3 ADAM D. FRIEDENBERG, Bar No. 205778  
4 JONATHAN A. ELDREDGE, Bar No. 238559  
5 One Walnut Creek Center  
6 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 210-2800  
Facsimile: (925) 945-1975  
Email: [cglynn@glynnfinley.com](mailto:cglynn@glynnfinley.com)  
[afriedenberg@glynnfinley.com](mailto:afriedenberg@glynnfinley.com)  
[jeldredge@glynnfinley.com](mailto:jeldredge@glynnfinley.com)

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
ConocoPhillips Company

9

12 HOUTAN PETROLEUM, INC. ) Case No. 3:07-cv-5627  
13 Plaintiff, )  
14 vs. )  
15 CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, a Texas )  
corporation and DOES 1 through 10, )  
16 Inclusive )  
17 Defendants. )  
18 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
Date: May 9, 2008  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 1  
Before: Hon. Samuel Conti

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND**  
**AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF**  
**DEFENDANT CONOCOPHILLIPS**  
**COMPANY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY**  
**JUDGMENT OF PLAINTIFF'S**  
**COMPLAINT**

20 Defendant ConocoPhillips Company (“ConocoPhillips”) submits this memorandum of  
21 points and authorities in support of its motion for summary judgment of Plaintiff Houtan  
22 Petroleum, Inc.’s (“Houtan Petroleum”) Complaint.

23 L. INTRODUCTION

24 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on two essential allegations: (1) that ConocoPhillips  
25 violated the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2801, et seq. (the "PMPA") by  
26 failing to provide 90 days' notice of termination of Houtan Petroleum's franchise; and (2) that  
27 ConocoPhillips' offer to sell its equipment and improvements to Houtan Petroleum was not  
28 "bona fide" under the PMPA.

1        In denying Houtan Petroleum's motion for preliminary injunction, the Court has already  
 2 adjudicated the first of these allegations. The operative franchise agreement included an explicit  
 3 notice of termination, which Houtan separately initiated. ConocoPhillips provided this notice to  
 4 Houtan Petroleum in May 2007, more than five months prior to the October 31, 2007 termination  
 5 date. Thus, as this Court has already found, ConocoPhillips provided the statutorily required 90  
 6 days' notice. (Docket No. 18 at 10:18-11:13.) The Court must therefore again adjudicate this  
 7 issue in ConocoPhillips' favor.

8        Houtan Petroleum is likewise unable to establish any triable issue on its claim that it was  
 9 entitled to a "bona fide offer" from ConocoPhillips to sell its equipment and improvements at the  
 10 Station. The PMPA requires that a franchisor make such an offer only where the franchisee  
 11 demands the offer within 30 days after receiving notice of termination. Here, Houtan Petroleum  
 12 waited several months after the statutory deadline passed to make such a demand.  
 13 ConocoPhillips thus was under no legal obligation to make a bona fide offer. Summary  
 14 judgment in favor of ConocoPhillips on Plaintiffs' Complaint is therefore required.

15 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

16        **A. The Ground Lease**

17        Houtan Petroleum operates a gasoline service station in Mountain View, California ("the  
 18 Station"). Houtan Petroleum formerly operated the Station as a ConocoPhillips franchisee and  
 19 sublessee pursuant to successive sublease and franchise agreements with ConocoPhillips.  
 20 (Docket No. 1 at ¶¶ 12-13.) ConocoPhillips did not own the Station property, but formerly  
 21 leased the Station from a third-party pursuant to an underlying property lease ("the Ground  
 22 Lease"). (*Id.* at ¶ 11.) Although ConocoPhillips attempted to obtain an extension of the Ground  
 23 Lease, these efforts were unsuccessful and the Ground Lease expired on October 31, 2007.  
 24 (Docket No. 13 at ¶¶ 3-6.)

25        / / /

26        

---

 27        <sup>1</sup> The full factual background of this matter is set forth in ConocoPhillips' response to the Court's  
 28 order to show cause and the Court's order denying Houtan Petroleum's motion for preliminary  
 injunction. (Docket Nos. 11, 18). Accordingly, ConocoPhillips repeats here only those factual  
 allegations directly relevant to this motion.

1           **B.     The Franchise Agreement**

2           The parties' most recent franchise agreement ("the Franchise Agreement") was effective  
 3    August 31, 2007. (Docket No. 5, Exh. A at 11-12 (¶ 2(a)).) Both parties knew when they  
 4    executed the Franchise Agreement in July 2007 that the Ground Lease would expire on October  
 5    31, 2007, and that ConocoPhillips would thereafter have no right to continue to sublease the  
 6    Station premises to Houtan Petroleum. (*Id.*) Indeed, Houtan Petroleum had already started  
 7    negotiating with the landowner for its own direct lease of the property several months earlier, in  
 8    April 2007. (Declaration of Jonathan A. Eldredge, Exh. A.) Houtan Petroleum ultimately  
 9    obtained such a lease agreement, pursuant to which it continues to occupy and operate the  
 10   Station. (Docket No. 5 at ¶ 8 and Exh. C.)

11           The Franchise Agreement gave explicit notice that the Ground Lease, and thus the  
 12    Franchise Agreement, would terminate on October 31, 2007. It provided that:

13           The term of this Agreement commences on September 1, 2007 and expires  
 14    on August 31, 2010 . . . provided, however, that . . . if  
 15    CONOCOPHILLIPS' underlying lease expires, is cancelled or terminates  
 16    for any reason on or prior to [August 31, 2010] . . . then this Agreement  
 17    shall terminate consistent with the cancellation or termination of said  
 18    underlying lease."

19           (Docket No. 5, Exh. A at ¶. 11-12 (¶ 2(a)) (emphasis added).)

20           In addition, Addendum 1 to the Franchise Agreement provided:

21           There is a possibility that the term of the underlying lease to the Station  
 22    might expire and not be renewed upon the underlying lease's expiration  
 23    date. DEALER hereby acknowledges CONOCOPHILLIPS' disclosure to  
 24    DEALER that this Agreement and the Station herein are subject to all the  
 25    terms and conditions of an underlying lease held by CONOCOPHILLIPS  
 26    in the property and premises, which underlying lease expires on  
 27    October 31, 2007 and that such underlying lease may expire and may not  
 28    be renewed during the Term of this Agreement. Thereby, the DEALER is  
 29    hereby on notice that this Agreement is hereby terminated on the date  
 30    the underlying lease expires or on a prior date in the event  
 31    CONOCOPHILLIPS' lessor terminates the underlying lease or the  
 32    underlying lease otherwise requires early termination.

33           CONOCOPHILLIPS is under no obligation to seek an extension or  
 34    renewal, or exercise any renewal options it may have, of such underlying  
 35    lease, but may do so at its discretion.

36           (*Id.* at p. 63 (original and added emphasis).)

1           ConocoPhillips provided the Franchise Agreement to Houtan Petroleum in May 2007.  
 2 (Docket No. 12 at ¶ 5.) Houtan Petroleum executed the Franchise Agreement, and separately  
 3 initialed the included notice of termination (i.e., Addendum 1), on July 6, 2007, 117 days prior to  
 4 the termination.<sup>2</sup> (Docket No. 5, Exh. A) Thus, as the Court has already found in denying  
 5 Houtan Petroleum's motion for preliminary injunction, the Franchise Agreement itself  
 6 constituted an effective and timely notice of termination under the PMPA. (Docket No. 18 at  
 7 8:3-11:13.)

8           **C.     Houtan Petroleum Demands a Bona Fide Offer**

9           Houtan Petroleum did not request a "bona fide offer" within 30 days after it received the  
 10 notice of termination, or even within 30 days after its signature of the notice. Instead, Houtan  
 11 Petroleum admits it waited several months, until October 18, 2007, to request an offer from  
 12 ConocoPhillips. (Docket No. 5 at ¶ 9 and Exh. D.) This occurred 104 days after July 6, 2007 --  
 13 the date on which Houtan Petroleum executed the Franchise Agreement and incorporated notice  
 14 of termination. ConocoPhillips nevertheless voluntarily offered to sell its property to Houtan  
 15 Petroleum.

16           **III.    ARGUMENT**

17           **A.     No Triable Issue Exists On Plaintiff's PMPA Claim (Count One).**

18           **1.     Expiration of the Ground Lease was a proper basis for  
 19 termination.**

20           The Court has already determined that the expiration of the Ground Lease was a proper  
 21 basis for termination of the Franchise Agreement. (Docket 18 at 8:3-9:27.) Under the PMPA, a  
 22 franchisor may terminate a franchise agreement upon "[t]he occurrence of an event which is  
 23 relevant to the franchise relationship and as a result of which termination of the franchise or  
 24 nonrenewal of the franchise relationship is reasonable. . . ." 15 U.S.C. § 2802(b). Such an event  
 25

26           

---

 27           <sup>2</sup> ConocoPhillips first provided the Franchise Agreement, and incorporated notice of termination,  
 28 to Houtan Petroleum in May 2007, as this Court has already recognized. (Docket No. 18 at 3:10-  
 11.) Thus, Houtan Petroleum had more than 117 days notice of the termination of the franchise  
 agreement.

1 includes “loss of the franchisor’s right to grant possession of the leased marketing premises  
 2 through expiration of an underlying lease.” 15 U.S.C. § 2802(c)(4).

3           This is precisely what occurred here. The Franchise Agreement disclosed that  
 4 ConocoPhillips would lose the right to grant possession of the Station Property when the Ground  
 5 Lease expired, and was consequently self-terminating.<sup>3</sup> (Docket No. 18 at 9:14-27, 10:18-  
 6 11:13.) Termination on this ground was permissible under the PMPA, as the Court has already  
 7 decided. (*Id.* at 8:20-9:1.) On this essential element of its claim, therefore, Houtan Petroleum  
 8 cannot raise any triable issue.

9           **2.       ConocoPhillips gave proper and timely notice of termination.**

10           The Court has also already determined that the Franchise Agreement itself constituted  
 11 timely notice of termination under the PMPA. (Docket 18 at 10:18-11:13 (“Houtan executed the  
 12 renewed Franchise Agreement on July 6, [2007,] and . . . the Agreement contained express  
 13 language indicating that Conoco’s inability to renew the Master Lease would necessarily require  
 14 termination of the Franchise Agreement”.) The PMPA ordinarily requires a franchisor to  
 15 provide at least 90 days’ notice of termination of a franchise agreement. 15 U.S.C. § 2804(a).  
 16 Here, the Ground Lease was to expire on October 31, 2007, two months after the Franchise  
 17 Agreement became effective. Thus it would have been impossible for ConocoPhillips to provide  
 18 90 days’ notice after commencement of the Franchise Agreement. This is why ConocoPhillips  
 19 provided the required notice of termination as part of the Franchise Agreement itself.

20           Houtan Petroleum executed the Franchise Agreement -- and separately initialed the  
 21 notice of termination -- on July 6, 2007, 117 days prior to the effective date of termination.  
 22 (Docket No. 18 at 3:10-14, 4:8-10, 11:5-9; Docket No. 5, Exh. A at 37, 63.) ConocoPhillips thus  
 23        ///  
 24        ///

25           

---

  
 26        <sup>3</sup> As Houtan Petroleum had been negotiating to lease the property directly from the landowner  
 27 since April 2007, it was aware of the impending termination even before ConocoPhillips was  
 28 certain it would be unable to obtain an extension of the Ground Lease. Indeed, as the Court has  
 already determined, “Houtan could reasonably have expected that by negotiating directly with  
 V.O. Limited to take over the Master Lease, the Franchise Agreement with Conoco would be  
 terminated.” (Docket 18 at 10:10-13.)

1 provided more than the required 90 days' notice, as this Court has already found.<sup>4</sup> For this  
 2 independent reason, Plaintiff cannot raise a triable issue on its PMPA claim.

3                   **3.       ConocoPhillips had no obligation to sell its equipment and  
 4                   improvements to Houtan Petroleum.**

5                   The PMPA provides explicit requirements that a franchisee must follow before a  
 6 franchisor is required to offer to sell its improvements and equipment to the franchisee. Where,  
 7 as here, a franchisor terminates a franchise agreement due to the loss of its underlying lease of  
 8 the station property, and the franchisee acquires possession of the real property, the franchisee  
 9 may request a bona fide offer to purchase the franchisor's improvements and equipment. 15  
 10 U.S.C. § 2802(c)(4)(C). Section 2802(c)(4)(C) states:

11                   in a situation in which the franchisee acquires possession of the leased  
 12 marketing premises effective immediately after the loss of the right of the  
 13 franchisor to grant possession . . . the franchisor (if requested in writing  
 14 by the franchisee not later than 30 days after notification was given  
 15 pursuant to section 2804 of this title) during the 90-day period after  
 notification was given pursuant to section 2804 of this title— (i) made a  
 bona fide offer to sell, transfer, or assign to the franchisee the interest of  
 the franchisor in any improvements or equipment located on the  
 premises. . . .

16 (Emphasis added.)

17                   The plain language of the PMPA thus gives a franchisee a right to a bona fide offer only  
 18 where the franchisee requests such an offer “not later than 30 days after notification [of  
 19 termination] was given.” *Id.* Here, it is undisputed that ConocoPhillips gave such notice (via the  
 20 Franchise Agreement) in May 2007. (Docket No. 12 at ¶ 5.) Houtan Petroleum signed the  
 21 Franchise Agreement and incorporated notice of termination on July 6, 2007. (Docket No. 18 at  
 22 3:10-14, 4:8-10, 11:5-9; Docket No. 5, Exh. A at 37, 63.) Even assuming that July 6 was the  
 23 effective date of notice, Houtan Petroleum still had until no later than August 5, 2007, to request  
 24 a bona fide offer under the PMPA. 15 U.S.C. § 2802(c)(4)(C). Houtan Petroleum admits,

25                   

---

<sup>4</sup> It is further undisputed that the notice of termination complied with all other requirements of  
 26 the PMPA -- i.e., that it (1) be written, (2) be served by certified mail or personally delivered to  
 27 the franchisee, (3) contain a statement of an intention to terminate the franchise together with the  
 28 reasons, (4) contain the date when termination is effective, and (5) enclose a Summary Statement  
 of the PMPA as prepared and published by the Secretary of Energy. 15 U.S.C. § 2804(c); *see*  
 Docket No. 5, Exh. A; Docket No. 12 at ¶ 5.

1 however, that it did not make its request for a “bona fide offer” until October 18, 2007, months  
 2 after the statutory deadline had passed. (Docket No. 3 at 2:2-5; Docket No. 5 at ¶ 9.)

3 As Houtan Petroleum failed to request a “bona fide offer” within the required 30 day  
 4 period, ConocoPhillips had no obligation under the PMPA to make such an offer. Houtan  
 5 Petroleum surrendered any PMPA right to such an offer by not making a timely demand.  
 6 ConocoPhillips’ voluntary offer did not, and could not, resurrect this right, and Houtan  
 7 Petroleum’s claim that the offer was not bona fide is therefore legally irrelevant and insufficient  
 8 to raise any triable issue.<sup>5</sup> For this additional reason, ConocoPhillips is entitled to judgment as a  
 9 matter of law.

10 **B. No Triable Issue Exists On Plaintiff’s Declaratory Relief Claim (Count Two).**

11 Plaintiff’s second claim is merely a reformulation of Plaintiff’s PMPA claim: it seeks a  
 12 declaration that ConocoPhillips violated the PMPA by terminating the Franchise Agreement and  
 13 failing to make a bona fide offer. (Docket No. 1 at ¶ 46.) However, declaratory relief is  
 14 appropriate only where the parties require guidance regarding their *prospective* rights and  
 15 obligations. It is well settled that such a claim “is inappropriate [where] ‘more effective relief  
 16 can and should be obtained by another procedure.’” *Cunningham Bros., Inc. v. Bail* (7th Cir.  
 17 1969) 407 F.2d 1165, 1168 (citation omitted); *see also, The Pantry, Inc. v. Stop-N-Go Foods,*  
 18 *Inc.* (S.D. In. 1991) 777 F.Supp. 713, 717 (“[w]hen declaratory relief and another remedy are  
 19 substantially similar, the court may exercise its discretion to dismiss the declaratory judgment  
 20 claim”). Here, plaintiff seeks a declaration that ConocoPhillips has *already* violated the PMPA.  
 21 The claim is therefore inappropriate and defective as a matter of law.

22

23 <sup>5</sup> The situation is not unlike that in which a plaintiff seeks to assert time-barred claims, relying on  
 24 conduct of the defendant that occurred *after* the limitations period has run. It is well-settled that  
 25 a defendant’s conduct after the limitations period has run cannot revive a stale claim. *See Aceves*  
*v. Allstate Insurance Co.* (9th Cir. 1995) 68 F.3d 1160, 1163, *citing Prudential-LMI Ins. Co. v.*  
*Sup. Ct.* (1990) 51 Cal.2d 674, 690 fn. 5; *see also Vashita v. Allstate Ins. Co.* (C.D. Cal. 1997)  
 26 989 F.Supp. 1029, 1033 (“it would be impossible for Allstate to waive the notice requirements  
 27 and/or the statute of limitations for the rental properties *after* the limitations period has already  
 28 passed”). Similarly, here, Houtan Petroleum relinquished any legal right to a bona fide offer by  
 not requesting one within the 30 day period required by the PMPA. That ConocoPhillips  
 nevertheless subsequently offered to sell its property to Houtan Petroleum cannot revive that  
 right.

1           In any event, as shown above, ConocoPhillips gave proper and timely notice of  
2 termination, and Houtan Petroleum failed to make a timely request to purchase ConocoPhillips'  
3 fixtures and equipment. Plaintiff therefore cannot raise any triable issue on its PMPA claim, and  
4 its redundant claim for declaratory relief likewise fails.

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**

6           For all the foregoing reasons, ConocoPhillips submits the Court should grant this motion  
7 and enter judgment in ConocoPhillips' favor on Plaintiff's Complaint.

8           Dated: April 4, 2008

9  
10           GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP  
11           CLEMENT L. GLYNN  
12           ADAM FRIEDENBERG  
13           JONATHAN A. ELDREDGE  
14           One Walnut Creek Center  
15           100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500  
16           Walnut Creek, CA 94596

17           By   
18           Attorneys for Defendant  
19           ConocoPhillips Company

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28